

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

2
3
4
5

6
7

8
9
10
11

12
13
14

5
6
7

8

20
21
22
23
24
25

1 The Office rejects claim 6 over Florin in view of Broadwin (*Office Action*
2 p.8). The Office recognizes that Florin does not teach “displaying the primary
3 display screen on a television through a web browser program.” The Office thus
4 relies on Broadwin for this teaching. However, Broadwin does not teach a web
5 browser program as recited in claim 1. Instead, Broadwin only teaches displaying
6 web-like still images having hyperlinks.

7 The Office contends that Broadwin teaches the claimed feature in col. 17,
8 lines 29-36 which refers to still images that indicate the nature of a referenced still
9 image “*much like a web home page*” (*see also* col. 17 lines 29-54). The context of
10 Broadwin is only a comparison to web page still image content. It says nothing
11 about displaying a display screen on a television through a web browser program,
12 as Applicant claims.

13 Moreover, Broadwin describes only still images *overlaid* on top of a
14 television program (col. 17, lines 31-33). Similarly, Florin describes *overlying*
15 graphic panels on a television channel (col. 13, lines 9-11 and 27-28). In contrast
16 to Broadwin and Florin, Applicant claims displaying via a web browser program
17 which entails *embedded* data in a video signal (*Specification* p.6) and an HTML
18 document having text and images that are displayable via a client television
19 (*Specification* p.10). Thus, displaying a screen on a television through a web
20 browser program, as recited in claim 1, entails embedding the screen for display
21 through the web browser program. Broadwin and Florin do not teach or suggest
22 this feature.

23 Accordingly, a combination of Florin and Broadwin fails to teach this
24 aspect of claim 1. Claim 1 is therefore allowable and the §103 rejection should be
25 withdrawn.

1 Claims 2-5 and 7-19 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon
2 claim 1 (some indirectly via intervening claims). Additionally, claims 3 and 15
3 are allowable for the following independent reasons:

4 Claim 3 describes that “the predetermined method comprises selecting the
5 television channel for a predetermined length of time.” The Office contends that
6 Florin describes this feature at col. 13, lines 42-45 (*Office Action* p.3). Applicant
7 disagrees. What Florin actually shows is a time bar that illustrates how much time
8 remains before a currently viewed program ends (col. 13, lines 42-45). This is not
9 “determining whether a television channel has been recently selected by a user”
10 (claim 1) after the television channel has been selected “for a predetermined length
11 of time” (claim 3). Accordingly, claim 3 is allowable for this additional reason.

12 Claim 15 describes that “the still image represents a last image captured on
13 the corresponding channel when the channel was de-selected.” The Office takes
14 official notice that a still video image is displayed when a video program is
15 stopped (*Office Action* p.9). Applicant disagrees with the Office’s basis for taking
16 official notice. A still video image is typically displayed when a conventional
17 VHS video is stopped, but not in the context of a television channel that has been
18 de-selected. Typically, de-selecting a television channel means selecting a
19 different television channel at which point the de-selected channel is no longer
20 viewable. Only because of Applicant’s disclosure can a de-selected channel
21 continue to be viewed as a still image. Accordingly, claim 15 is allowable for this
22 additional reason.

23 Claims 20, 26, 29, and 33-36 each similarly describe displaying a display
24 screen through a web browser program. Specifically, claims 20, 26, and 34-35
25 recite “displaying the primary display screen through a web browser program”;

1 claim 29 recites that “the primary display screen comprises a screen image
2 displayed through an interactive display environment including World Wide Web
3 content”; claim 33 recites “displaying the primary display screen on a television
4 through a web browser program”; and claim 36 recites “the primary display screen
5 being displayed through a web browser program.”

6 As described above in the response to the rejection of claim 1, Broadwin
7 does not teach displaying a display screen through a web browser program.
8 Furthermore, neither of the other two cited references – Florin nor Bedard – teach
9 or suggest displaying a display screen through a web browser program.
10 Accordingly, the Florin-Bedard-Broadwin combination fails to teach this recited
11 aspect of the claims. Claims 20, 26, 29, and 33-36 are therefore allowable and the
12 §103 rejection should be withdrawn.

13 Claims 21-25 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 20.

14 Claims 27-28 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 26.

15 Claims 31-32 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 29.

16 Additionally, claims 31 and 32 are allowable for the following independent
17 reasons:

18 Claim 31 describes that “the primary display screen is a Hypertext Mark-up
19 Language (HTML) object.” Applicant describes an HTML *object* having structure
20 extension tags and attributes to describe how a particular HTML object will
21 behave and how the object will be displayed on a television screen (*Specification*
22 p.15). The HTML object allows the content producers to tag some content as
23 television content and other content as something else (e.g., images, text, etc.).
24 Also, the HTML format allows control over screen construction and layout.
25

1 The Office recognizes that Florin and Bedard fail to teach this feature, but
2 states that Broadwin discloses HTML data (*Office Action* p.11). Broadwin does
3 not disclose that a primary display screen is an HTML *object*. Broadwin only
4 describes a preference for HTML link *data* that is, once again, overlaid on top of
5 an audio or video output (col. 6, lines 12-13; col. 7, lines 28-30). The link data
6 provides a user with web-like hyperlinks to still images (*Abstract*). However,
7 simple HTML data as contemplated by Broadwin does not render obvious an
8 HTML *object* as claimed by Applicant in claim 31.

9 Accordingly, the Florin-Bedard-Broadwin combination fails to teach or
10 suggest a display screen that is an HTML object. Claim 31 is therefore allowable
11 for this additional reason.

12 Claim 32 describes an Internet system comprising a “server system”,
13 “client systems”, and “a wide area network.” The Office recognizes that neither
14 Florin nor Bedard teach an Internet system. The Office suggests, however, that
15 Broadwin discloses an Internet system (*Office Action* p.11). Applicant disagrees.


16 Broadwin does not disclose an Internet system, but rather only “interactive
17 web-like content” and “one or more channels for transferring MPEG stills and
18 utilizes hyperlinks to enable users to navigate within these stills in a similar
19 manner to an Internet web page” (col. 19, lines 61-67). Mere *web-like* content and
20 a comparison to an Internet web page does not teach an Internet *system* as the
21 Office suggests. Broadwin does not disclose a server system, client systems, or a
22 wide area network in the context of an Internet system. Accordingly, the Florin-
23 Bedard-Broadwin combination fails to teach or suggest the aspects of claim 32.
24 Claim 32 is therefore allowable for this additional reason.
25

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25


Lewis C. Lee
Reg. No. 34,656
(509) 324-9256

Lewis C. Lee
Reg. No. 34,656
(509) 324-9256